

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/066,749	02/06/2002	Ji Yong Kim	P67577US0	4774
43569	3569 7590 04/25/2006		EXAMINER	
MAYER, BROWN, ROWE & MAW LLP			SCUDERI, PHILIP S	
1909 K STRE	ET, N.W. DN, DC 20006		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,	, 20 2000		2153	

DATE MAILED: 04/25/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)
		10/066,749	KIM ET AL.
	Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit
		Philip S. Scuderi	2153
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication app or Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address
A SH WHIC - Exter after - If NO - Failu Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DANS IN THE MAIL	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tim vill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from , cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).
Status			
2a)⊠	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 Ap This action is FINAL. 2b) This Since this application is in condition for allowar closed in accordance with the practice under E	action is non-final. nce except for formal matters, pro	
Dispositi	ion of Claims		
5)□ 6)⊠ 7)□	Claim(s) 1-16 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw Claim(s) is/are allowed. Claim(s) 1-16 is/are rejected. Claim(s) is/are objected to. Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	wn from consideration.	
Applicati	on Papers		
10)	The specification is objected to by the Examine The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) access Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct The oath or declaration is objected to by the Example 1.	epted or b) objected to by the I drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See ion is required if the drawing(s) is ob	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). jected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
Priority (ınder 35 U.S.C. § 119		
a)!	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents 2. Certified copies of the priority documents 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents application from the International Bureau See the attached detailed Office action for a list	s have been received. s have been received in Applicati rity documents have been receive u (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	on No ed in this National Stage
2) Notice 3) Information	ce of References Cited (PTO-892) ce of References Cited (PTO-892) ce of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) or No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Do 5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:	

DETAILED ACTION

This Office action is in response to applicant's amendment filed on 10 April 2006.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The rejections under 35 USC 112, second paragraph have been withdrawn because applicant's amendments have overcome the rejections.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments, see pages 7-8, filed on 10 April 2006, with respect to the combination of U.S. Patent No. 6,199,096 to Mirashrafi et al. ("Mirashrafi") and U.S. Patent No. 6,785,708 to Busey et al. ("Busey") failing to teach that the IRC server uses the IRC protocol to handle both the control message and a chatting message together have been fully considered and are persuasive. For this reason, the claims clearly distinguish over the combination of Mirashrafi and Busey as set forth in the last Office. Accordingly, the rejections under 35 USC 103(a) set forth in the last Office action have been withdrawn.

Applicant's arguments, see pages 7-8, filed on 10 April 2006, with respect to U.S. Patent No. 6,785,708 to Busey et al. ("Busey") not teaching that the event is a synchronization updating event have been fully considered but are not persuasive. In the interview conducted on 05 April 2005 the examiner suggested that further limiting the event might overcome the 102 rejections using the Busey reference. However, the examiner did not specifically suggest language for doing so. The specific language used in the claims is insufficient to overcome the rejection.

The event corresponds to a user browsing a web page. For example, the references teaches that Sarah found a great website (column 4, lines 62-63), which at minimum suggests that Sarah is or was browsing the website. Browsing a website is a synchronization updating event because it was common knowledge that downloading a web page "updates" a browser by "synchronizing" the browser with information stored on a web server.

Applicant's arguments with respect to the sending of an HTTP link not constituting a control message have been fully considered but are not persuasive. A message comprising a HTTP link is used by another user to direct (i.e., control) a browser to access a web page referenced by the link (column 5, lines 29-32). Accordingly, such a message can reasonably be considered a control message.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,785,708 ("Busey").

Regarding claims 1 and 11, Busey teaches a Web collaborative browsing method using an IRC server (figure 1, 148; figure 3, 320; column 3, lines 61-64), said method comprising:

a), by a collaborative browsing client, opening a collaborative browsing session (column 4, lines 6-14);

b), creating a control message (figure 3, message A) corresponding to a synchronization updating event (column 5; lines 1-9; Sarah browsing a website) when the event occurs in a Web browser (figure 3, 312) of a collaborative browsing client (figure 3, 310) while said client is connected to a Web server via said Web browser to conduct Web surfing (column 5; lines 1-9), and then sending the created control message (column 5, lines 50-53) to said IRC server (figure 1, 148; figure 3, 320) over a network (figure 3);

c), by said server, receiving the sent event occurrence control message (figure 3; 320 receives message A) and transferring the received control message to a plurality of clients participating in said collaborative browsing session opened by said collaborative browsing client (column 5, line 59); and

d), by a collaborative browsing component program of each of said session participating clients, instructing a Web browser of a corresponding one of said session participating clients in response to said control message to request the same event as that having occurred in said collaborative browsing client, from said Web server (column 5, lines 53-55),

wherein the IRC server uses the IRC protocol (column 3, lines 57-64; column 4, lines 36-44) to handle both the control message (column 4, lines 62-62) and a chatting message together (column 4, lines 64-65).

Regarding claim 7, Busey teaches a web collaborative browsing system using an Internet relay chat (IRC) protocol and a standard IRC server, said system comprising:

event occurrence processing means for creating a control message (figure 3, message A) corresponding to a synchronization updating event (column 5; lines 1-9; Sarah browsing a website) when the event occurs in a Web browser (figure 3, 312) of a collaborative browsing client (figure 3, 310) while said client is connected to a Web server via said Web browser to conduct Web surfing (column 5; lines 1-9), and then sending the created control message (column 5, lines 50-53) to said IRC server (figure 1, 148; figure 3, 320) according to said IRC protocol (column 3, lines 61-64);

event synchronization means for receiving said control message via said IRC server and instructing a corresponding Web browser in response to the received control message to request the same event as that having occurred in said collaborative browsing client, from said Web server (column 5, lines 53-55; automatically acting on the embedded links); and

wherein the IRC server uses the IRC protocol (column 3, lines 57-64; column 4, lines 36-44) to handle both the control message (column 4, lines 62-62) and a chatting message together (column 4, lines 64-65).

Regarding claims 2, 8, and 12, Busey further teaches:

an event occurrence detector for detecting said event when said event occurs in said Web browser of said collaborative browsing client while said client is connected to said web server via said Web browser thereof to conduct the Web surfing (figure 3, 310; column 5, lines 1-9; Sarah performs the event detecting etc.);

an event analyzer for analyzing the contents of the detected event to determine the type of said event (column 5, lines 1-9; Sarah determines whether the event is "great"); and

a message sender for creating said control message corresponding to the analyzed event contents and sending the created control message to said IRC server according to said IRC protocol (column 5, lines 1-9).

Regarding claims 3 and 13, Busey does not expressly disclose whether the network is a wired or wireless network, but the network must be at least one of the two.

Regarding claims 4, 9, and 14, Busey further teaches:

a message receiver for receiving said control message from said IRC server (figure 3, 334);

a message analyzer for analyzing the received control message to determine the type of said event having occurred in said collaborative browsing client (column 5, lines 53-55; determining if the message comprises a hyperlink); and

an event requester for applying a command based on the determination result to said corresponding Web browser to instruct said corresponding Web browser to request the same event as that having occurred in said collaborative browsing client, from said Web server (column 5, lines 53-55; acting on the hyperlink).

Regarding claims 5 and 15, Busey further teaches that the collaborative browsing component program is implemented using ActiveX (column 6, lines 6-9).

Regarding claims 6, 10, and 16, Busey further teaches that the event is a Web document request event (column 5, lines 50-53).

Application/Control Number: 10/066,749

Art Unit: 2153

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Philip S. Scuderi whose telephone number is (571) 272-5865. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 9:00 am - 5:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Glenton B. Burgess can be reached on (571) 272-3949. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Art Unit: 2153

PS

KRISNA LIM PRIMARY EXAMINER